

From SPK Commander:

1. On page 13 it states that the manual does 6 things:
 - a. Establishes a culture of customer focus
 - b. Establishes a baseline project delivery process for all work
 - c. Integrates corporate doctrine with corporate Automated Information Systems
 - d. Establishes effective corporate management practices
 - e. Implements and executes corporate quality management practices
 - f. Clarifies roles
2. Although the manual does reflect very specific steps and procedures to manage projects, it seems to fall short of accomplishing all of the above 6 items. I believe the preface and executive summary initiate the reader as to the manual's purpose and its applicability into the USACE PMBP, but the lack of an explanatory section linking these goals with the numerous flow charts leaves the reader searching to understand the true connection. **Response: The key to real understanding will be in the PMBP curriculum being developed. This will provide an opportunity for individual learning about the Business Process and the P2 automated information system through a series of self-study CD sessions followed by small group discussions and formal training classes. These sessions will emphasize both the cultural changes desired and how to use the automated systems.**

a. I could not see why this manual 'establishes a culture of customer focus'. There appears to be one process that specifically mentions customers (scope definition), but little else. I did not see numerous customer linkages that would promote such a culture. **Response: Emphasis has been provided to the customer as an active and key member of the PDT in determining scope and quality for project execution. Based on your comments and those of others many improvements have been made in this area.**

b. Given the wide and thorough dissemination of the manual, along with its mandatory use, achieving a baseline delivery process should be attainable. What is not clear is the definition of 'work' vs. 'projects'. I suppose all projects are work, but there exist work that are not projects. The ER seems to talk about projects while this manual talks about work. The words we use are important and there seems to be a slight disconnect between the ER and this manual with respect to these two terms. **Response: The ER has attempted to define a philosophy for the Corps based upon approaching both our “traditional project/programs workload” and our “support services workload” from a project management business process perspective. The Business Process Manual also takes this approach by attempting to create as much corporate level consistency as possible between “traditional projects/programs” and “support services” thus using the term “all work”. However, the Business Process and P2 are being fielded in two phases thus “support services” work will be expanded during phase II.**

c. I believe this goal is misnamed. The manual does not integrate doctrine with the AIS. The AIS (P2) should enable a process (this manual) that supports the doctrine (ER). That's what the manual should do, and it is supportive of our new doctrine. Two results mentioned in the preface are the elimination of data input duplication and data calls. These are two very important characteristics which will increase its acceptance and use at District level. **Response: You are absolutely correct regarding the importance of eliminating data calls and data entry duplication. As LTG Flowers has indicated, this manual is intended to be treated as a doctrinal extension of ER 5-1-11.**

d. I think that this manual describes a process that will establish a corporate management practice. It should be effective, but I did not find any information on the ability to share data. If the process can actually assist in the management of workload, budgets, and projects, then it will be a success. Even more valuable to District operations is the ability to perform workload/workforce scheduling and leveling. **Response: The corporate management practices established by this manual will enable P2 (an "enterprise" system that will eventually tie all corporate AIS together) to make data available at all levels since there will be a "consistency" in where data is found and how it is used.**

e. There are only 3 pages devoted to quality in the manual. The flowchart does not reflect any quality processes. I fail to see how this manual will serve as the 'cornerstone' of our quality system. Capturing lessons learned is a great concept, but I did not see any disciplined process that incorporated those lessons. **Response: There have been numerous changes to the manual to better incorporate quality objectives. Lessons Learned is a continuing activity as required by the Change Management process. Dr. Checks is currently being evaluated for its potential use in the USACE lessons learned process.**

f. I like the idea that the process manual will not rely on an employee's organizational assignment. But, I failed to see how the process manual clarified PDT roles. **Response: The interaction between PDT members will be defined in the Communications Plan and is governed by local SOP.**

3. The Manual is done very well overall. However, the most important piece is yet to be done, ie. roles and responsibilities. This is the main issue still unresolved in the whole Project Management implementation. There is no understanding of the division of roles between Lead Planners (Study Managers) and Project Managers. I hope that this will be resolved in the Manual such that most of the PM's are returned to the Technical elements, as Baltimore District has done. **Response: Project management is a role and should not be thought of as an organizational element. The Study Manager may or may not be the PM but will be a member of the PDT in either case.**

4. Oracle Tutor flow charts: show linkage to next BP. **Response: Rejected. Oracle Tutor doesn't support this functionality, however, we have attempted to show this information in the Activity Preface for each process.**

5. Modify Oracle Tutor presentation....System References example should include other types of documents....REF and PROC **Response:** Concur, see reworded master documents.

6. Tone of the BPs seems to adopt more of CW terminology and flavor. **Response:** Reworded. See master document.

7. Printed Process manual- identify both the PROC/REF # and Title. **Response:** The manual is a web tool and is not intended to be printed.

8. I found the site easy to navigate. **Response:** Thank you for taking the time to review the manual as a web tool. The review comments we have received have been very helpful in improving the business process.

9. Develop a “Big Picture” executive summary of the overall processes...short version. We found that complete ideas concerning a process, or embodying several processes, are scattered throughout the individual processes. That is, to understand a complete idea, a User had to read several processes to collate similar areas of text. For instance, *Resource Estimates* and *Workload Analysis* shared common ideas. The business processes embody a basic agenda that is sometimes subtly stated or inferred in the text. We recommend that the front end “Big Picture” clearly state what is the overall goal regarding behavioral changes and certain strict data input goals. For instance, it is not clear between two processes whether only lower-level activities be resourced, or all lower-level activities must be resourced. Or, is Earned Value analysis the ultimate goal of using P2? If so, state that clearly. Although the business processes cover the issue of Resourcing work out to other districts and maybe regions, these BPs do not cover the issue of how one region communicates with another region that they are doing work in their geographical area. The question remains: should cross-regional work be allowed? Is so, a better communication process between regions needs to be established. If not, then solid policy must be written stating that requirement. The P2 system could be designed to not allow the entry of a project located in another region without specific lock-in permissions.

Response: The Executive Summary is being revised based on many similar comments; however, the key to real understanding will be in the PMBP curriculum being developed. This will provide an opportunity for individual learning about the Business Process and the P2 automated information system through a series of self-study CD sessions followed by small group discussions and formal training classes. These sessions will emphasize both the cultural changes desired and how to use the automated systems. However, the Business Process is not intended to reiterate existing Corps policy or procedures for technical products or activities. Policy and procedures already detail the coordination requirements necessary for cross-regional work.

10. With regard to “brokering” work, there are sometimes program (account) managers in one district, and subordinate project managers who may come from other districts. The BPs should discuss how they will each use P2. **Response:** Each project will have only ONE Project Manager. Individuals on the PDT may come from anywhere in the

Corps. P2 is an “enterprise” system that will allow data to be viewed and entered by members of the PDT irrespective of their geographical location.

11. He/she or s/he determine best way to be gender neutral Response: Reworded. See master document.

12. Check format on reference documents. They are currently not consistent between documents. Should they be consistent? Response: Reference documents are not as structured as Process Documents. The edit team is reviewing for a minimum level of consistency.

13. I had no problem with the information contained in the Executive Summary, the Preface or Initiating a Project. Response: Thank you for taking time to review and share your thoughts.

14. Suggest adding an introduction that tells folks what they are about to see and how they should approach it. Such an introduction should be explained in layman’s terms, and show the general processes in the document, before getting into the specific chapters. Also, the lay out of the document is somewhat cumbersome and not intuitive, although the PMBP Process Flowchart helps. Response: The Executive Summary and Preface are being revised based on many similar comments; however, the key to real understanding will be in the PMBP curriculum being developed. This will provide an opportunity for individual learning about the Business Process and the P2 automated information system through a series of self-study CD sessions followed by small group discussions and formal training classes. These sessions will emphasize both the cultural changes desired and how to use the automated systems. It should be noted that the Business Process Manual will be a web based tool and the user will not be aware of a “document layout” but will hot link to the parts of the document that are needed when they are needed.

Glossary & Acronyms

1. Need to ensure that Acronyms and glossary are well developed. Acronym list duplicated. Suggest eliminating list on p. 159. Acronym list is very incomplete. Suggest including AIS, BP, PMBP, PY, RBC, BOC, etc. **Response: Concur.**

2. The definition that is provided for Quality Assurance is actually closer to the definition of Quality Management. Quality Assurance is the oversight of the quality control processes to insure their effectiveness in the production of quality products. **Response: Quality System and Quality Management Plan references have been revised.** See master documents.

3. Define Resource Provider in glossary. Reference ER1110-1-8152 para 10d
<http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/usace-docs/eng-regs/er1110-1-8152/entire.pdf>
Response: Concur.
4. CDMO, Defense Contract Management Office. Why is it not DCMO?
Response: Concur.
5. Define Project Work Item in Glossary **Response:** Concur.
6. Need to add P3e terms in relation to resource types/expense items/"resource estimate" in glossary **Response:** Concur.
7. Define P2 and P3e in Glossary **Response:** Concur.
8. On page 210, paragraph at top of page, there is extensive use of the Acronyms PY & PY+9. Where are these Acronyms defined? Or, are they meant to be BY & BY+9 for budget year or FY for fiscal year? **Clarify this and ensure consistent use through out the document.** **Response:** Concur, see reworded master document.
9. On pages 11 and 159 there is a list of Acronyms. Why not combine them into one list? **Response:** Concur.

Initiating a Project in P2: Identify what source of funding should be used for project activities dealing with P2 prior to "Initiating a Project in P2." **Response: Non-project specific funds such as coordination accounts or overhead should be used. See note in step 1 of PMP/PgMP Development and in the Activity Preface of Initiating a Project in P2.**

CW Programs and Budget Process (All Sections).

1. What is the intent of breaking it down into 6 sections? Suggest renaming each of the associated processes to read:
 - CW Programs and Budget Process - Master Index
 - Section 1 – HQUSACE Budget Allowance and OMB Submission
 - Section 2 – Congressional Budget Submission
 - Section 3 – Development of Initial and Capability Budget
 - Section 4 – Defense before Coingress...we want the \$\$\$\$
 - Section 5 - Allotment and Budget Execution

Where is RM in these processes? Appears to be duplication of effort between the RM folks and Program folks. **Response:** See reworded master document.
2. Scope and Policy statements in all sections are identical. Suggest that a pictorial of the Entire Budget Process be included as a reference and for comparison and overlay on the PDT cycle. **Response:** Concur, see reworded master document.

3. Business Process Flow chart: check link between CW Budget Process and all phases of the BP. Differentiate flow lines between “stop and complete return lines” vs. “calling or goto lines” **Response:** See reworded master document.

Civil Works Program-Specific Information –

1. Distribution Block. Project Manager should be on following line, not on same line as Project Delivery Team. In printed manual they are on the same line....on the web, it is okay. **Response:** Concur.

HTRW Program - Specific Information.

1. Will there be a reference document for OEW, Radioactive Materials, and/or CMW or will they be incorporated in other documents **Response: Will be incorporated in the HTRW reference document under development. Please contact George Evans in HQUSACE who is preparing the document if you have suggestions.**

Project workload and analysis –

1. BMO/RM needs to determine (how, who and level of detail/certainty) information required to be loaded into the application to accurately perform an analysis of workload. **Response:** See reworded master document.